

Appln. No. 11/063,345

Attorney Docket No. 12787-003

II. Remarks

The aforementioned Notice stated that the response to the Office Action filed on December 20, 2007 ("the Response") was considered non-compliant because Applicants cannot replace the abstract in its entirety unless the abstract has been substantially amended. If only minor amendments have been made, the applicants must show the changes.

Applicants, in their Response, made minor amendments to the abstract and replaced the abstract instead of showing amendments as required. To correct this defect, amendments made to the abstract are now shown.

Applicants' remarks and claim amendments in any prior responses are applicable to the re-submitted sections and the examiner's attention is directed to those remarks and amendments as if they are reprinted herein.

Conclusion

In view of the above and previously submitted amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April 24, 2008
Date


John A. Lingl (Reg. No. 57,414)

BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
ATTORNEYS